

REMARKS

These remarks respond to the Office Action mailed July 26, 2007. Claims 2-7, 9, 11-24, and 26 are pending in the application. Claims 9, 11, and 18 are independent claims. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of all claims.

Claim Objections

Claims 18, 20-24 were objected to as containing intended use language. These claims have been amended to rectify the error. Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for the suggested language.

Claim Amendments

Claims 3, 4, 9, 11, 13, 14, 18, and 20-24 have been amended to change “information” to “non-signature information.” Support for this amendment may be found throughout the specification and in particular on page 8, lines 12-19 (“information such as patient name, supplier name, physician name, etc.”). Applicant respectfully asserts that this element distinguishes the pending claims over the U.S. Patent No. 6,796,489 to Slater et al which merely allows a first user to digitally sign and second user to validate a document (see Fig. 2A and col. 7 line 56 - col. 8 line 3), not adding “non-signature information.”

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. § 102

The Examiner rejected all of the pending claims as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,796,489 to Slater et al. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Slater is directed to a system for processing documents with embedded electronic signatures using signature blocks to embed the digital signatures. Slater fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of the pending claims in this application.

Independent claim 9 recites “a method of interactive processing of a document...” Many of the elements of the method recited in claim 9 are not taught or suggested by Slater.

Slater does not teach or suggest “providing at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer network for non-signature information to complete the document.” In the Examiner’s Response to Arguments on page 7 of the Office Action, the Examiner states that “Once a first user signs (i.e. response) then the document is automatically routed to a second destination (i.e. second user) prompting them for their signature.” The Examiner points to col. 9, lines 51-55 for anticipating this element. But the cited portion of Slater discusses only the transmission of a completed and signed document to a storage location. This is described in column 7, lines 50-58. In the system described by Slater, the “digitally signed and notarized electronic document” is transmitted to a destination server where it is “processed or, more specifically in this example, recorded.” Thus, the document is routed to a storage server once it has been “completed and signed.” The document is never routed to any user with a request for signature. Slater does not teach or suggest “providing at least one request to a first user at a first location on a computer network for information to complete the document” as specifically recited in Slater. Thus, independent claim 9 is not anticipated by Slater.

Another element of claim 9 recites “receiving at least one response from the first user to the at least one request for information to complete the document...” Because Slater does not teach or suggest any request to a user, there cannot be “at least one response from the first user...” in Slater as recited in claim 9. This element is also not taught or suggested by Slater.

Another element of claim 9 recites “writing information obtained from the at least one response from the first user to at least one digital file...” Because Slater does not teach or

suggest a response as discussed above, there is nothing in Slater that teaches or suggests that a processor write “information obtained from the at least one response...”

Claims 2-7 and 26 ultimately depend on independent claim 9. As discussed above, Slater fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 9. Thus, claims 2-7 and 26, which depend from claim 9, are not anticipated by Slater.

Independent claim 11 recites a system for interactive processing of a document comprising, among other elements, a processor directed by instructions included in a program to execute a number of steps. Many of these elements are not taught or suggested by Slater. Claim 11 recites “sending of at least one request determined from a selected document to a first user at a first location on a computer network.” As discussed above in connection with claim 9, Slater does not teach or suggest the “sending of at least one request.” Thus, Slater does not anticipate independent claim 11.

Claims 12-17 ultimately depend on independent claim 11. As discussed above, Slater fails to teach or suggest all of the elements of claim 11. Thus, claims 12-17, which depend from claim 11, are not anticipated by Slater.

Independent claim 18 is directed to a computer readable program code executable on a computer, including computer readable program code to execute many of the same elements enumerated discussed above in connection with claims 9 and 11. Thus, independent claim 18 is not anticipated by Slater for at least the same reasons discussed above in connection with claims 9 and 11.

Conclusion

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Office Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 26, 2007

/ Matthew E. Hanley /
Matthew E. Hanley
Registration No. 51,773
SONNENSCHNEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-1080
(312) 876-8000